**Single amino acid changes decouple two opposite activities of a viral auxiliary replication protein**

Qin Guo[1], Shaoyan Zhang[1], Rong Sun[1], Xiaolong Yao[1], Satyanarayana Tatineni[2], Tea Meulia[1,3], and Feng

Qu[1]*

[1]Department of Plant Pathology, [3]Molecular and Cellular Imaging Center, Ohio Agricultural Research and

Development Center, The Ohio State University. Wooster, OH 44691.

[2]USDA-ARS and Department of Plant Pathology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68583

*Primary contact: Feng Qu, qu.28@osu.edu; 330-263-3835

**ABSTRACT**

We recently reported that the auxiliary replication protein encoded by the single-stranded,

positive sense RNA genome of turnip crinkle virus (TCV), designated p28, also repressed TCV replication

under certain conditions, and this repressive function accounted for superinfection exclusion (SIE)

among TCV variants. However, it was unknown whether the replication role of p28 could be molecularly

separated from its opposite role of repressing replication. Here we report the identification of two single

amino acid (aa) mutations that decouple these two functions. Using an *Agrobacterium* infiltration-based

delivery system, we transiently expressed a series of p28 deletion and point mutants, and tested their

ability to elicit SIE against a co-introduced TCV replicon. We found that substituting alanine (A) for valine

(V) and phenylalanine (F) at p28 positions 181 and 182, respectively, modestly compromised SIE in

transiently expressed p28 derivatives. Upon incorporation into TCV replicons, the V181A and F182A

mutations decoupled TCV replication and SIE diametrically. While V181A impaired SIE without

detectably compromising replication, F182A abolished TCV replication but had no effect on SIE once the

replication of the F182A replicon was restored through complementation. Furthermore, F182A also

decoupled the replicational roles of p28 and p88, the other TCV-encoded replication protein that

encompasses p28, as the F182A replicational defect was readily complemented by transiently expressed

p28, but not p88. Together our findings demonstrated that the replication and SIE functions of p28 were

molecularly separable, and provided valuable resources for in-depth mechanistic dissections of SIE.

**IMPORTANCE**

Superinfection exclusion (SIE) insulates virus-infected cells from subsequent invasion by the same

or closely related viruses. SIE has been observed in both animal and plant virus-infected cells. Therefore,

a thorough understanding of how SIE is achieved at the molecular level is expected to inspire novel

strategies for combating virus infections in humans, animals, and plants. Our group has been using

turnip crinkle virus (TCV) to elucidate the molecular interactions critical for SIE elicitation. The current

study builds on our previous observation that TCV SIE is elicited by one single TCV-encoded protein

(p28), and further identifies key regions and amino acids that are needed for SIE. This study identifies

key amino acid changes that decouple the replication and SIE functions of p28, hence provides valuable

resources for in-depth mechanistic dissection of SIE.

**INTRODUCTION**

Many viruses block the subsequent entry and/or replication of the same or closely related viruses in the cells they occupy, through a process known as superinfection exclusion (SIE). These viruses include important human and animal pathogens such as human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), West Nile virus (WNV), and vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV) (1–5), as well as plant pathogens like tobacco mosaic virus (TMV), citrus tristeza virus (CTV), cucumber mosaic virus (CMV), wheat streak mosaic virus (WSMV), and turnip crinkle virus (TCV) (6–11). SIE in plant virus infections is also thought to underlie the well-documented cross protection phenomenon (12–14). Cross protection insulates plants from a disease-causing virus by simply pre-inoculating them with a mild variant of the same virus. Although cross protection has been adopted for plant virus disease management for at least 50 years (12), its underlying molecular mechanism remains poorly understood.

A number of earlier studies investigated SIE of plant viruses by tagging the same virus with two different fluorescent proteins (e.g. green fluorescent protein [GFP] and mCherry) (6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16). These studies demonstrated that most of the viruses excluded their own variants at the single cell level, thus implicating intracellular exclusion as one of the primary causes for SIE. Using this approach, Zhang and colleagues (15) found that SIE in TCV infections occurred inside individual cells, and it acted to block the replication of the superinfecting TCV replicons. Strikingly, this replicational blockage was mediated by p28, one of the TCV-encoded proteins required for TCV genome replication (15). The fact that p28, the auxiliary replication protein of TCV, functions to both facilitate and repress the replication of TCV genomic RNA (gRNA), along with the observation that fluorescent protein-tagged p28 formed large intracellular bodies that coalesced other p28 variants, prompted the hypothesis that p28 undergoes concentration-dependent conformational changes to accommodate its dual functions. Namely, the p28 protein assumes one conformation at lower concentrations to enable replication, but another self-perpetuating conformation at higher concentrations to block replication (15, 17).

TCV is a small icosahedral plant virus with a (+)-strand RNA genome that encodes five proteins.

The 5' proximal p28 and its C-terminally extended derivative – p88 – are both translated directly from

TCV genomic RNA (gRNA), and are themselves required for gRNA replication (Fig. 1A). Since the

production of p88 depends on infrequent translational read-through of the p28 stop codon (UAG), the

intracellular concentration of p28 far exceeds that of p88 (18). However, p28 lacks the conserved RNA-

dependent RNA polymerase (RdRP) motif, is hence known as the auxiliary replication protein. On the

other hand, p88 is thought to be directly responsible for gRNA replication through its RdRP activity. TCV

additionally encodes two small movement proteins, p8 and p9, that are translated from subgenomic

RNA 1 (sgRNA1), and a capsid protein/silencing suppressor from sgRNA2 (Fig. 1A) (19–21).

In the recent study by Zhang and colleagues (15), we established that p28 was necessary and

sufficient to elicit SIE against a co-introduced TCV replicon, and that it likely accomplished this by

sequestering freshly translated p28 molecules into self-perpetuating p28 polymers. These earlier

observations raised at least three questions: (i) does the SIE activity of p28 require any specific domains

or amino acid residues in p28? (ii) can this replication-repressing SIE activity of p28 be decoupled from

its essential role in replication? (iii) can either of the p28 functions (replication and SIE) be decoupled

from the RdRP activity of p88? This last question is of interest as p88 encompasses the entire p28 at its

N-terminal 2/5 (Fig. 1A). The current study addresses these questions by identifying a 12 amino acid (aa)

region in p28 that is required for efficient SIE. Moreover, single aa changes within this region not only

enabled the decoupling of SIE activity of p28 from its replication function, but also the separation of the

replication function of p28 from that of p88. Our findings unveil novel mechanistic details of SIE

elicitation by TCV p28, and provide powerful new tools for further elucidation of the molecular basis of

TCV SIE.

**RESULTS**

**Deletion mutagenesis of p28-GFP fusion protein identifies a small region needed for robust SIE**

**elicitation**. We recently reported that a C-terminal GFP fusion bolsters the ability of p28 to elicit SIE to

TCV (15). Specifically, expression of the p28-GFP fusion protein in *Nicotiana benthamiana* cells abolished

the replication of TCV_sg2R, an mCherry-expressing TCV replicon, in the same cells, erasing the

replication-dependent mCherry fluorescence (15). Additionally, the strong replicational repression by

p28-GFP correlated with the occurrence of large, irregular green fluorescent foci in these cells (15).

These easy-to-monitor fluorescent phenotypes prompted us to use p28-GFP as the launch pad to map

domains in p28 essential for SIE elicitation. To systemically screen for these domains, we generated a

series of in-frame deletions within the p28 portion of p28-GFP (Fig. 2A). The effect of these deletions on

the SIE-eliciting ability of p28 was evaluated by expressing the mutant proteins in *N. benthamiana* cells,

and assessing the replication of the co-introduced TCV_sg2R replicon with Northern blot hybridizations.

In addition, we also monitored the replication-dependent diffuse mCherry fluorescence, as well as the

GFP-fluorescent mutant fusion proteins, using confocal microscopy.

As shown in Fig. 2B, deletion of the N-terminal half of the 250-aa p28 caused only minimal loss in

the SIE elicitation by p28-GFP, leading to a very modest recovery of TCV_sg2R replication (mutant Δ2-

125. Fig. 2A; and Fig. 2B, lanes 7 and 8). A specific N-terminal domain could not be delineated because

none of the smaller deletions within this region, including Δ2-36, Δ37-50, Δ37-100, Δ51-100, and Δ76-

125, led to detectable replication of TCV_sg2R (Fig. 2B, lanes 11-18; Fig. 2C, lanes 11-12). These results

suggest that, in the presence of the C-terminal GFP tag, the N-terminal half of p28 plays a modest role in

SIE elicitation. Consistent with this conclusion, the slightly shorter Δ2-100 mutation caused an SIE

release that is much weaker than Δ2-125, hence only occasionally detected (Fig. 2B, lanes 9 and 10; Fig.

2D, lanes 7 and 8).

Interestingly, the Δ2-155 mutant, which extends the Δ2-125 deletion for just 30 aa, permitted a

substantially higher level of TCV_sg2R replication (Fig. 2C, compare lanes 7-8 with 9-10). However, a

separate deletion of the 30 aa alone (Δ126-155) had a much weaker, though consistently detected

release of TCV_sg2R replication (Fig. 2C, compare lanes 13, 14 with lanes 7, 8). This suggested that loss

of SIE activity by the mutant Δ2-155 could be attributed to the additive or synergistic effect of two

regions – aa 2-125 and 126-155. Nevertheless, specific SIE-eliciting sequence motifs or aa residues

within the first 155 aa region could not be reliably identified with the GFP-tagged constructs.

Surprisingly, another relatively small deletion (Δ156-190, 35 aa in total) caused a loss of SIE activity

that rivaled the large Δ2-155 deletion (Fig. 2C, compare lanes 15, 16 with 7 and 8), thus identifying a

region with a relatively strong effect. Beyond aa 190, the entire C-terminal 60-aa region could be

removed without detectably compromising the SIE-eliciting activity of p28-GFP (Fig. 2D, Δ191-250, lanes

9 and 10). Indeed, a double deletion mutant combining the Δ2-100 and Δ191-250 deletions was no

worse than Δ2-100 alone at repressing TCV_sg2R replication (Fig. 2D, compare lanes 13, 14 with lanes 7

and 8). This further confirmed that the last 60-aa region was dispensable for SIE elicitation by p28-GFP.

Notably, the loss of SIE activity by many of the deletion mutants was accompanied by dramatic

changes in the intracellular behavior of mutant proteins. For example, although the SIE loss caused by

the Δ2-100 deletion was minimal, the Δ2-100-GFP formed large foci in substantially fewer cells than the

wild-type p28-GFP (Fig. 2E, panels 3 and 4), and instead exhibited a distribution resembling soluble GFP

in many cells (Fig. 2E, panel 4). Nevertheless, the smaller, more numerous foci formed by the GFP-

tagged Δ2-125, Δ126-155, and Δ156-190 proteins appear to be consistent with a requirement for larger

aggregates in SIE elicitation (Fig. 2E, panels 5, 7, and 8). Further supporting this idea is the observation

that the Δ2-155-GFP mutant protein was predominantly diffusely distributed, suggestive of a soluble

protein (Fig. 2E, panel 6).

**Additional deletions within the aa 156-190 region identify a 12-aa stretch with a significant role**

**in eliciting SIE.** That a substantial loss of SIE-eliciting activity could be inflicted by a mere 35-aa deletion

(Δ156-190) prompted us to further interrogate this small region using the p28-GFP fusion construct. To

this end, three smaller deletions (Δ156-170, Δ171-182, Δ183-190, deleting 15, 12, and 8 aa, respectively)

were generated and the resulting deletion mutants were analyzed for their ability to elicit SIE against

TCV_sg2R. As shown in Fig. 3A, neither Δ156-170 (lanes 9 and 10) nor Δ183-190 (lanes 13 and 14)

caused detectable loss of the SIE-eliciting activities. By contrast, deletion of aa 171-182 appeared to

account for most of the SIE loss observed with the Δ156-190 mutant.

We next investigated whether this 12-aa region contained any specific aa residue(s) critical for SIE

elicitation by generating three consecutive 4-aa deletions. As shown in Fig. 3B, lanes 9-14, all three

deletion mutants compromised the SIE-eliciting activity of p28-GFP to similar extents as the 12-aa

deletion mutant Δ171-182 (lanes 7 and 8). Therefore, it appears that the entire 12-aa region is needed

for eliciting a robust SIE. We then chose the last four aa residues of this region for single aa mutagenesis

and changed each of them to alanine (Fig. 3B, lanes 15-22). When these single aa mutants were

introduced into plant cells along with the TCV_sg2R replicon, only the F182A mutant caused a barely

detectable accumulation of TCV_sg2R RNAs (Fig. 3B, lanes 21 and 22), suggesting that the phenylalanine

to alanine change very weakly compromised the SIE-eliciting ability of p28-GFP.

Confocal microscopy showed that Δ156-170, Δ171-182, and Δ183-190 all abolished the ability to

form large aggregates (Fig. 3C, panels 3 and 4, also see Fig. 2E), and instead formed smaller, but more

numerous foci that sometimes arranged along cell boundaries. The Δ156-170 mutant was noteworthy

because it did allow occasional escape of red fluorescent cells, thus TCV_sg2R replication, even though

such low-level replication was not detected with Northern blotting (see above). This suggested that it

was important to use both Northern blotting and confocal microscopy to capture the full spectrum of

SIE-eliciting activities by these mutants.

Interestingly, the smaller, 4-aa deletion mutant Δ179-182 and the larger, 12-aa deletion mutant

Δ171-182 behaved highly similarly when inspected with confocal microscopy. Both permitted TCV_sg2R

replication in easily detectable numbers of cells, even though their replication levels as measured with

Northern blotting was much lower than controls without any p28-GFP derivatives (Fig. 2B, lanes 7-14).

Finally, three of the four single aa mutants, P179A, R180A, and V181A, formed large aggregates very

similar to those of wild-type p28-GFP, though smaller foci were also seen (Fig. 3C, panels 7-9). By

contrast, in cells treated with the F182A mutant, large aggregates were absent (Fig. 3C, panel 10).

Among these cells, replication-dependent red fluorescence was occasionally observed, thus confirming

the weak TCV_sg2R replication detected with Northern blotting (Fig. 2B, lanes 21-22).

**Replacing the C-terminal GFP with a double HA tag unveils additional regions important for SIE-**

**elicitation by p28**. Experiments using the p28-GFP fusion protein mutants identified the 12-aa region

spanning aa 171-182 as critically important for p28 to elicit SIE. But they failed to identify any other p28

regions that were specifically needed for SIE elicitation. These results contrasted with our previous

observations implicating the N-terminus of p28 in SIE elicitation. We showed earlier that fusing a short

G11 tag (25 aa) at the N-terminus rendered p28 incapable of eliciting SIE (15). We also found that a

truncated form of p28 missing the first 36 aa was no longer able to elicit SIE (15, 22). Did the C-terminal

GFP fusion in p28-GFP allow p28 to circumvent certain other critical regions, possibly through the

tendency of GFP to self-dimerize (23)? To address this question, we decided to adopt p28-HA, another

strong SIE-eliciting p28 variant with a C-terminal, duplicated hemagglutinin tag (15, 22). To this end, the

GFP in all deletion mutants described earlier was replaced with the HA tag and the resulting HA-tagged

mutants were retested for SIE induction.

As shown in Fig. 4A, the HA substitution indeed revealed a role for the N-terminal region in SIE

elicitation. The SIE-eliciting activity of p28-HA was not detectably weakened by deleting aa 51-100 or

191-250, suggesting that up to 110 amino acid residues of p28 could be removed without detectably

weakening SIE elicitation. However, this activity is clearly compromised by deletions of aa 2-36, 126-155,

and 156-190, and aa 37-100, 76-125, and 183-190 to lesser extents. Therefore, use of p28-HA as the

backbone permitted the identification of two additional p28 regions with potentially specific roles in SIE

elicitation, namely aa 2-50, and 126-155.

**Use of p28-HA reveals key amino acid residues within the aa 171-182 region critical for SIE**

**elicitation**. We next attempted to fine-map the 171-182 region, whose deletion compromised SIE in

both GFP and HA-tagged p28 variants, using HA-tagged mutants. As shown in Fig. 4B, use of the p28-HA

backbone revealed partial SIE losses caused by the Δ156-170 and Δ183-190 deletions (lanes 7, 8, 11, 12)

that were undetectable with the p28-GFP backbone (Fig. 3A, lanes 9, 10, and 13, 14). However, it is

important to note that only the deletion of the aa 171-182 core sequence fully recapitulated the

phenotype of the larger 156-190 deletion (Fig. 4B, compare lanes 5, 6 with 9, 10). Furthermore, each of

the three smaller, 4-aa deletions (Δ171-174, Δ175-178, and Δ179-182) within the aa 171-182 region

inflicted an SIE loss that is nearly identical to the 12-aa Δ171-182 (Fig. 4B, lanes 13-18).

We next re-examined the effect of four single aa substitutions using the p28-HA backbone. As

shown in Fig. 4C, the very weak SIE loss caused by the F182A mutation in p28-GFP background now

became easily detectable (lanes 15 and 16). Indeed, only the R180A mutation failed to inflict a

meaningful loss in the SIE-eliciting activity of p28-HA (lanes 11 and 12). By contrast, both P179A and

V181A mutations correlated with weak losses in SIE elicitation, with P179A being slightly less disruptive

than V181A (lanes 9, 10, 13 and 14).

**TCV replicons containing the V181A mutation overcome SIE in a substantial fraction of cells**. We

next wondered whether the single-aa mutations that compromised SIE in transiently expressed p28-GFP

and p28-HA had similar effects in TCV replicons. To resolve this question, we introduced the V181A and

F182A mutations into TCV_sG6H and TCV_sg2R, two TCV replicons that encode GFP [sG6H denotes GFP

with an N-terminal 6XHis tag (24)] and mCherry in place of CP, respectively (Fig. 1). These replicons were

then tested in co-infected cells to determine whether the mutations compromised SIE of TCV.

Although the GFP-encoding replicon (TCV_sG6H) appeared to replicate less robustly, and

produced much less sgRNAs (Fig. 5A, lane 2), it produced GFP at easily detectable levels (Fig. 2B, top

left), probably due to translational initiation from an internal ribosomal entry site identified recently

(25). Replicons with the V181A mutation (V181A_sG6H and V181A_sg2R) replicated to levels

comparable to wild-type replicons encoding wild-type p28 (and p88) (Fig. 5A, compare lanes 4, 5 with 2,

3, respectively). By contrast, the F182A mutation abrogated TCV replication to levels below the

detection limit of Northern blotting (lanes 6 and 7). Next, the V181A replicons were subjected to co-

infection experiments to assess the levels of SIE. As shown in Fig. 5B, while wild-type replicons exhibited

strong SIE that precluded the co-expression of GFP and mCherry in the same cells (top row), the V181A

replicons permitted such co-expression in approximately 19% of green- or red-fluorescent cells. These

results demonstrated that the same V181A mutation that compromised the ability of p28-HA to repress

TCV replication also compromised the ability of p28 to elicit SIE in TCV replicons.

**The F182A mutation disrupts the replication function of p28 but not p88**. Although in the p28-HA

background the F182A mutation more severely compromised SIE than V181A (Fig. 4), it also abolished

TCV replication when incorporated in replicons (Fig. 5). Since the p28 coding sequence is shared by p88

in the replicon context, it is possible that F182A disrupted the replication function of p28, or p88, or

both. To resolve this issue, we attempted to complement the replication of the F182A_sg2R replicon

using transiently expressed, tag-free p28 and p88 (Fig. 1B). As shown in Fig. 6A, F182A_sg2R replication

was restored to easily detectable levels by transiently expressed p28 (compare lanes 9, 10 to 5, 6), but

not p88 (lanes 13 and 14). Therefore, the F182A mutation primarily disrupted the auxiliary replication

function of p28. While perturbation of p88 function by F182A could not be completely ruled out, such

perturbation did not abolish TCV replication. Taken together, the F182A mutation severely debilitated

the replication function of p28, but not p88. In conclusion, this mutation decouples the replication

functions of p28 and p88.

**An F182A-containing replicon, upon replicational complementation, exerts robust SIE against a**

**wild-type replicon.** We next examined whether the replicational defect of the F182A-containing

replicons could be complemented by another replicon encoding a replication-competent p28, and

whether the p28(F182A) protein produced by the complemented replicon might exert SIE against the

replicon that provided the complementing p28. To answer this question, we paired the F182A_sg2R

replicon with TCV_sG6H or V181A_sG6H, in co-infections of *N. benthamiana* cells. As shown in Fig. 6B,

panels 4 and 6, both TCV_sG6H and V181A_sG6H replicons complemented the F182A defect, enabling

an approximately ten-fold increase in the number of cells replicating F182A_sg2R (Fig. 6B, panels 3, 4,

and 6; Fig. 6C, red bars in groups 3, 4, and 6).

However, complementation by the two GFP-encoding replicons led to starkly different SIE

phenotypes. The complementation by TCV_sG6H, which encodes a wild-type p28, gave rise to mCherry-

expressing cells that never contained GFP fluorescence (Fig. 6B, panel 4; Fig. 6C, group 4). Conversely,

the GFP-expressing cells also never contained mCherry. Because the TCV_sG6H construct must reside in

the same cells as the F182A_sg2R construct in order to supply the replication-complementing wild-type

p28, these observations strongly suggested that the p28(F182A) protein, now produced by the

replicating F182A_sg2R replicon, exerted a powerful SIE to block TCV_sG6H replication. Note that we

have shown in a previous study (15) that commencement of TCV replication in different agro-infiltrated

*N. benthamiana* cells was highly asynchronous, meaning many cells could translate wild-type p28

protein from the 2X35S-driven replicon transcripts, but failed to immediately embark on replicon

replication. These cells would provide the p28 protein to complement the replication of F182A_sg2R,

the latter then turn around to exert SIE against the p28-providing wild-type replicon.

The assertion that both F182A_sg2R and TCV_sG6H constructs must have been present in those

red fluorescent cells is further bolstered by the contrasting SIE phenotype observed from the

complementation mediated by V181A_sG6H (Fig. 6B, panel 6; Fig. 6C), as these experiments were

carried out in parallel. Specifically, when the replication of F182A_sg2R was complemented with the

V181A_sG6H replicon, approximately one half of the red fluorescent cells also contained GFP

fluorescence. This probably reflected the partial loss of SIE-eliciting capacity by the p28(V181A) protein

(Fig. 5B. Also see Fig. 6B, panel 5). But this result also demonstrated that two different replicon

constructs readily enter the same agro-infiltrated cells. Together these results indicated that when

expressed from a replicating replicon, the p28(F182A) protein is fully capable of exerting a strong SIE

against another replicon in the same cells, despite its inability to facilitate replication on its own.

Therefore, in addition to decoupling the replication function of p28 and p88, the F182A mutation also

decoupled the SIE function and replication function of p28 – but in a manner diametrical to the V181A

mutation.

**DISCUSSION**

SIE protects host cells from being sequentially infected by the same virus. Although use of SIE in

controlling plant virus diseases has been extensively documented, its underlying molecular mechanism,

and its evolutionary rationale, remain poorly understood (13). Using the model virus TCV, we have

previously established that SIE occurred inside the super-invaded cells, and acted to repress the

replication of the superinfecting viral genomes (15, 26). We further discovered that SIE in TCV infections

is mediated by a single, TCV-encoded protein (p28) that is also needed for TCV replication, likely through

the formation of a self-perpetuating polymeric state that sequesters homologous p28 monomers. This

model raised the possibility that SIE exists to ensure that progeny genomes of a virus are excluded from

additional rounds of replication, thus minimizes error accumulation within single cells (17). By extension,

cells invaded by many copies of the same virus simultaneously, frequently in the form of collective

infectious units (27–30), likely also experience similar molecular events that ensure only a small number

of the entered genomes is allowed to replicate, and be exposed to cellular level selections. If this is true,

then viral mutants that weaken SIE are expected to relax this restriction, allowing more viral genomes to

replicate for multiple cycles in the same cells, causing faster error accumulation in viral populations, and

likely more swift collapse of these populations.

The current study was designed to test the predictions of our working hypothesis by first

identifying mutations within TCV p28 that compromise SIE. Our systematic deletion mutagenesis of p28,

using two different C-terminally tagged forms of p28 as the backbones, allowed us to narrow down the

SIE-eliciting activity of p28 to three regions: aa 2-50, 126-155, and 156-190. The aa 156-190 region was

then further interrogated because deletion of this region caused a consistent loss of SIE in both p28-GFP

and p28-HA backgrounds. These efforts ultimately led to the identification of two amino acid residues,

namely valine (V) and phenylalanine (F) at positions 181 and 182, respectively, whose replacement by

alanine (A) in replicons led to the decoupling of p28 replication function and its SIE elicitation function.

The apparent inconsistency of the defects caused by the F182A mutation in different construct

contexts warrants further discussions. Specifically, in transiently expressed p28-GFP as well as p28-HA

contexts, F182A weakened SIE to levels detectable with Northern blotting. Yet replicons containing the

same mutation exhibited no loss in SIE elicitation, even though the p28(F182A) mutant protein was

unable to support replication on its own. This discrepancy raises the important question of whether the

SIE-eliciting capacity of transiently expressed p28 derivatives reliably predicts the same activity of

replicon-borne p28. To reconcile this discrepancy, we propose as a working hypothesis that the F182A

mutation accelerates the turnover of the p28 protein. Below we provide the rationale for this

hypothesis.

We observed previously that p28 without any fusion tags only modestly repressed the replication

of a TCV replicon when transiently expressed, but was strongly repressive when expressed from another

TCV replicon (15, 17). This was likely due to the difference in the amount of p28 protein translated in

these two situations. The abundance of p28 mRNA transcribed from transient expression constructs was

far lower than from the gRNA of a replicating TCV replicon, suggesting that the concentration of p28

protein would also be substantially lower, thus diminishing the formation of the SIE-eliciting polymeric

state. Accordingly, the C-terminally tagged p28-GFP and p28-HA could have elicited robust SIE by

increasing the p28 concentration indirectly, by slowing down the turnover of the fusion proteins.

Conversely, the SIE-eliciting activity of these fusion proteins would be weakened by the F182A mutation,

if such a mutation accelerates p28 turnover. Importantly, the SIE defect of this mutation would be

neutralized if the increased translation from replicons more than offset the faster turnover, thus

explaining the maintenance of strong SIE in F182A replicons. Furthermore, this hypothesis would

probably also explain the replication defect of p28(F182A) if, as we proposed earlier, the replication

function of p28 also entails lateral polymerization that could only be sustained when a concentration

threshold is reached (17). We plan to test this hypothesis in the near future, once a high quality p28

antibody becomes available.

To summarize, the current study identifies two single aa mutations in TCV p28 that differentially

impaired the two opposite functions of p28 – replication and SIE elicitation, hence decoupling these two

functions of p28. These mutations will allow us to investigate the impact of SIE in the rate of mutation

accumulation in TCV populations, providing insights regarding the evolutionary rationale for preserving

SIE functionality in virus infections. These investigations would in turn unravel potential targets for

antiviral therapy, and prompt novel management strategies for virus diseases.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Constructs**. Constructs 2X35S::TCV_sg2R, p28-HA, p28 (tag-free), and Core35S::p88 (tag-free)

were described in previous studies (15, 22). The 2X35S::p28-GFP construct was a slightly modified

version of the previous p28-GFP. The new version replaced the NotI site (GCGGCCGCA) linking p28 and

GFP coding sequences with a BamHI site plus three additional nts (GGATCCGGA). Nearly all deletion

mutants, as well as single aa substitution mutants, were generated using synthetic gBlocks fragments

(IDT, Coralville, IA) that were integrated into various backbone plasmids (e.g. p28-GFP, p28-HA, or

TCV_sg2R) using Gibson Assembly cloning (NEB, Ipswich, MA). The identities of all new constructs were

verified with Sanger sequencing.

**Agro-infiltration**. Upon verification, all of the constructs were introduced into *Agrobacterium*

*tumefaciens* strain C58C1 with electroporation (31, 32). To carry out the experiments described in the

Results section, various combinations of *Agrobacterium* suspensions were mixed together and delivered

into *N. benthamiana* leaves as described (22, 26, 31, 33). A p19-expressing *Agrobacterium* strain was

included in all combinations to alleviate RNA silencing-mediated mRNA degradation.

**RNA extraction and Northern blotting**. Total RNA was extracted from agro-infiltrated *N.*

*benthamiana* leaves using the Direct-zol RNA Miniprep kit (Zymo Research, Irvine, CA). To ensure

consistency, four equivalent leaf sections derived from infiltrated leaves of four different plants were

pooled before RNA extraction. The RNA extraction procedure included a DNase treatment step that

removes DNA contamination. The RNA was then quantified with NanoDrop and subjected to Northern

blotting as described (22, 26, 31, 33).

**Confocal microscopy and quantification of fluorescent cells.** Confocal microscopic observations

were carried out using a Leica Confocal microscope (TCS SP5) available at Molecular and Cellular Imaging

Center at the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, The Ohio State University. To

quantify the percentage of cells expressing GFP, mCherry, or both (Fig. 5), the agro-infiltrated *N.*

*benthamiana* leaf sections were photographed under the confocal microscope, at the low magnification

(10X), and for three separate channels (GFP, mCherry, and merged). For each treatment, five

independent leaf sections were photographed, resulting in 15 images. These images, typically

encompassing 40-50 cells, were then divided into 100 equal subdivisions with the grid line feature of the

PhotoShop software. Subdivisions that are more than 50% filled with a given fluorescence (GFP,

mCherry, or both) were counted as positive for the respective protein, the total counts of which

represent a percentage in a given image. For each treatment five counts were obtained, and standard

deviation were computed using these counts.

**FIGURE LEGENDS**

**Figure 1.** TCV genome organization, and the configurations of the constructs used in this study. **A:**

the organization of the 4,054 nt single-stranded, positive sense (+) TCV genome. The various boxes with

labels within (e.g. p28, p88, p8, p9, p38) denote the proteins encoded by the TCV genome, with the

boundaries of some ORFs shown. The three 3' proximal proteins (p8, p9, and p38) are translated from

two subgenomic RNAs (sgRNA1 and 2). **B**: representative constructs used in this study. Most constructs

were equipped with the strong 35S promoter with the enhancer duplicated (2X35S) in order to ensure

efficient transcription. Only the last, p88-expressing construct was driven by the relatively weak core

35S promoter as high level of p88 translation was shown to repress TCV replication (22). The top most

construct is a replicon shown previously to launch TCV replication in plant cells, leading to mCherry

expression from the sgRNA2 (19, 33). All other constructs direct transient expression of the respective

proteins in the absence of TCV replication.

**Figure 2**. Deletion mutagenesis on the p28-GFP backbone identifies the aa 156-190 region as

needed for robust SIE. **A**: diagrams of deletion mutants of p28-GFP showing their respective deleted

regions. **B, C, D:** Northern blotting results showing the levels of replicational repression imposed on the

TCV_sg2R replicon by p28-GFP and its deletion mutants. The p19 silencing suppressor was included to

mitigate the impact of RNA silencing. The double loadings represented two independent samples

extracted from different leaves. The positions of gRNA, sgRNA1 and 2 were highlighted with arrows (g,

sg1, sg2). EB: ethidium bromide-stained gel. **E:** confocal images of *N. benthamiana* leaf cells treated with

select p28-GFP deletion mutants along with the TCV_sg2R replicon.

**Figure 3**. Mapping the aa 156-190 region of p28-GFP with smaller deletions and single aa

exchanges identifies aa 171-182 as the key determinant of SIE. **A and B**: Northern blots showing the

levels of replicational repression imposed on the TCV_sg2R replicon by various smaller deletion and

single aa mutants of p28-GFP. **C:** confocal images of *N. benthamiana* leaf cells treated with select p28-

GFP mutants along with the TCV_sg2R replicon.

**Figure 4.** Use of the p28-HA backbone reveals additional regions contributing to SIE elicitation by

p28. All panels are Northern blots showing the levels of replicational repression imposed on the

TCV_sg2R replicon by various mutants of p28-HA.

**Figure 5**. Replication and SIE of mutant replicons with the V181A and F182A mutations. **A:**

Northern blot showing the replication (lanes 4-7) and SIE (lanes 10-13) of the mutant replicons encoding

different fluorescent proteins (GFP or mCherry). **B:** confocal images showing robust SIE between two

wild-type replicons (top panels), and the partially compromised SIE between the two V181A mutant

replicons. The quantification was based on five independent leaf areas each containing 40-50 cells. See

Materials and Methods for details. G = GFP-fluorescent cells, R = mCherry-fluorescent cells, G+R = cells

containing both GFP and mCherry.

**Figure 6**. In replicons, the F182A mutation selectively abrogates the replication function of p28,

but not its ability to elicit SIE. **A:** Northern blot showing that the replicational defect of the F182A

replicon was complemented by transiently expressed p28 but not p88. **B:** confocal images showing that

the replicational defect of the F182A replicon was also complemented by co-introduced wild-type and

V181A replicons, and the successfully complemented F182A replicon exerted robust SIE against the wild-

type replicon. **C:** quantification of replicational complementation and SIE of the F182A replicon. The

numbering of the experimental sets corresponded to Fig. 6B. In all sets leaf areas of 40-50 cells each

were chosen from five different leaves and counted for cells with different fluorescence (GFP, mCherry,

or both).

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

We thank the labs of Drs. Lucy Stewart and Peg Redinbaugh for generous equipment sharing, and

other members of the Qu lab for stimulating discussions. This study was supported by a grant from the

National Science Foundation (#1758912), a SEEDS grant from the Ohio Agricultural Research and

Development Center, Graduate Assistantships from OSU and OARDC to Q.G. and R.S., respectively, as

well as tuition assistances to S.Z., R.S., and Q.G. from the Department of Plant Pathology, OSU.

**LITERATURE**

1.     Nethe M, Berkhout B, van der Kuyl AC. 2005. Retroviral superinfection resistance. Retrovirology

409            2:52.

410     2.     Schaller T, Appel N, Koutsoudakis G, Kallis S, Lohmann V, Pietschmann T, Bartenschlager R. 2007.

411            Analysis of Hepatitis C Virus Superinfection Exclusion by Using Novel Fluorochrome Gene-Tagged

412            Viral Genomes. J Virol 81:4591.

413     3.     Tscherne DM, Evans MJ, von Hahn T, Jones CT, Stamataki Z, McKeating JA, Lindenbach BD, Rice

414            CM. 2007. Superinfection exclusion in cells infected with hepatitis C virus. J Virol 81:3693–3703.

415     4.     Zou G, Zhang B, Lim P-Y, Yuan Z, Bernard KA, Shi P-Y. 2009. Exclusion of West Nile Virus

416            Superinfection through RNA Replication. J Virol 83:11765.

417     5.     Simon KO, Cardamone JJ, Whitaker-Dowling PA, Youngner JS, Widnell CC. 1990. Cellular

418            mechanisms in the superinfection exclusion of vesicular stomatitis virus. Virology 177:375–379.

419     6.     Julve JM, Gandía A, Fernández-del-Carmen A, Sarrion-Perdigones A, Castelijns B, Granell A, Orzaez

420            D. 2013. A coat-independent superinfection exclusion rapidly imposed in Nicotiana benthamiana

cells by tobacco mosaic virus is not prevented by depletion of the movement protein. Plant Mol

Biol 81:553–564.

7.  Dietrich C, Maiss E. 2003. Fluorescent labelling reveals spatial separation of potyvirus populations

in mixed infected Nicotiana benthamiana plants. J Gen Virol 84:2871–2876.

8.  Bergua M, Zwart MP, El-Mohtar C, Shilts T, Elena SF, Folimonova SY. 2014. A viral protein mediates

superinfection exclusion at the whole-organism level but is not required for exclusion at the

cellular level. J Virol 88:11327–11338.

9.  Miyashita S, Kishino H. 2010. Estimation of the size of genetic bottlenecks in cell-to-cell movement

of soil-borne wheat mosaic virus and the possible role of the bottlenecks in speeding up selection

of variations in trans-acting genes or elements. J Virol 84:1828–1837.

10.  Takahashi T, Sugawara T, Yamatsuta T, Isogai M, Natsuaki T, Yoshikawa N. 2007. Analysis of the

Spatial Distribution of Identical and Two Distinct Virus Populations Differently Labeled with Cyan

and Yellow Fluorescent Proteins in Coinfected Plants. Phytopathology 97:1200–1206.

11.  Folimonova SY. 2012. Superinfection Exclusion Is an Active Virus-Controlled Function That Requires

a Specific Viral Protein. J Virol 86:5554.

12.  Ziebell H, Carr JP. 2010. Cross-Protection, p. 211–264. *In* Advances in Virus Research. Elsevier.

13.  Zhang X-F, Qu F. 2016. Cross Protection of Plant Viruses: Recent Developments and Mechanistic

Implications, p. 241–250. *In* Wang, A, Zhou, X (eds.), Current Research Topics in Plant Virology.

Springer International Publishing, Cham.

14.  Folimonova SY. 2013. Developing an understanding of cross-protection by Citrus tristeza virus.

Front Microbiol 4:76.

15.   Zhang X-F, Sun R, Guo Q, Zhang S, Meulia T, Halfmann R, Li D, Qu F. 2017. A self-perpetuating

repressive state of a viral replication protein blocks superinfection by the same virus. PLOS Pathog

13:e1006253.

16.   Tatineni S, French R. 2016. The Coat Protein and NIa Protease of Two Potyviridae Family Members

Independently Confer Superinfection Exclusion. J Virol 90:10886–10905.

17.   Zhang X-F, Zhang S, Guo Q, Sun R, Wei T, Qu F. 2018. A New Mechanistic Model for Viral Cross

Protection and Superinfection Exclusion. Front Plant Sci 9.

18.   White KA, Skuzeski JM, Li W, Wei N, Morris TJ. 1995. Immunodetection, Expression Strategy and

Complementation of Turnip Crinkle Virus p28 and p88 Replication Components. Virology 211:525–

534.

19.   Cao M, Ye X, Willie K, Lin J, Zhang X, Redinbaugh MG, Simon AE, Morris TJ, Qu F. 2010. The Capsid

Protein of Turnip Crinkle Virus Overcomes Two Separate Defense Barriers To Facilitate Systemic

Movement of the Virus in Arabidopsis. J Virol 84:7793–7802.

20.   Zhang X, Zhang X, Singh J, Li D, Qu F. 2012. Temperature-Dependent Survival of Turnip Crinkle

Virus-Infected Arabidopsis Plants Relies on an RNA Silencing-Based Defense That Requires DCL2,

AGO2, and HEN1. J Virol 86:6847–6854.

21.   Qu F, Ye X, Morris TJ. 2008. Arabidopsis DRB4, AGO1, AGO7, and RDR6 participate in a DCL4-

initiated antiviral RNA silencing pathway negatively regulated by DCL1. Proc Natl Acad Sci

105:14732–14737.

22.   Zhang S, Sun R, Guo Q, Zhang X-F, Qu F. 2019. Repression of turnip crinkle virus replication by its

replication protein p88. Virology 526:165–172.

23.    Shaner NC, Steinbach PA, Tsien RY. 2005. A guide to choosing fluorescent proteins. Nat Methods

464           2:905–909.

465    24.    Powers JG, Sit TL, Qu F, Morris TJ, Kim K-H, Lommel SA. 2008. A Versatile Assay for the

466           Identification of RNA Silencing Suppressors Based on Complementation of Viral Movement. Mol

467           Plant Microbe Interact 21:879–890.

468    25.    May J, Johnson P, Saleem H, Simon AE. 2017. A Sequence-Independent, Unstructured Internal

469           Ribosome Entry Site Is Responsible for Internal Expression of the Coat Protein of Turnip Crinkle

470           Virus. J Virol 91:e02421-16.

471    26.    Zhang X-F, Guo J, Zhang X, Meulia T, Paul P, Madden LV, Li D, Qu F. 2015. Random Plant Viral

472           Variants Attain Temporal Advantages During Systemic Infections and in Turn Resist other Variants

473           of the Same Virus. Sci Rep 5.

474    27.    Chen Y-H, Du W, Hagemeijer MC, Takvorian PM, Pau C, Cali A, Brantner CA, Stempinski ES,

475           Connelly PS, Ma H-C, Jiang P, Wimmer E, Altan-Bonnet G, Altan-Bonnet N. 2015.

476           Phosphatidylserine Vesicles Enable Efficient En Bloc Transmission of Enteroviruses. Cell 160:619–

477           630.

478    28.    Mirabelli C, Wobus CE. 2018. All Aboard! Enteric Viruses Travel Together. Cell Host Microbe

479           24:183–185.

480    29.    Andreu-Moreno I, Sanjuán R. 2018. Collective Infection of Cells by Viral Aggregates Promotes Early

481           Viral Proliferation and Reveals a Cellular-Level Allee Effect. Curr Biol 28:3212-3219.e4.

30.   Miyashita S, Ishibashi K, Kishino H, Ishikawa M. 2015. Viruses Roll the Dice: The Stochastic Behavior

of Viral Genome Molecules Accelerates Viral Adaptation at the Cell and Tissue Levels. PLOS Biol

13:e1002094.

31.   Qu F, Ren T, Morris TJ. 2003. The Coat Protein of Turnip Crinkle Virus Suppresses

Posttranscriptional Gene Silencing at an Early Initiation Step. J Virol 77:511–522.

32.   Qu F, Ye X, Hou G, Sato S, Clemente TE, Morris TJ. 2005. RDR6 Has a Broad-Spectrum but

Temperature-Dependent Antiviral Defense Role in Nicotiana benthamiana. J Virol 79:15209–

15217.

33.   Zhang X-F, Sun R, Guo Q, Zhang S, Meulia T, Halfmann R, Li D, Qu F. 2017. A self-perpetuating

repressive state of a viral replication protein blocks superinfection by the same virus. PLOS Pathog

13:e1006253.

**Guo et al., 2019 Fig. 1**

**A**

TCV:

**B**

**2X35S::TCV_sg2R (replicon):**

**2X35S::p28-GFP (transient):**

**2X35S::p28-HA (transient):**

**2X35S::p28 (tag-free, transient):**

**Core35S::p88 (tag-free, transient):**

**A**

**B**

**C**

**Guo et al., 2019 Fig. 4**

**A**

**B**

**C**

**Guo et al., 2019 Fig. 5**

## A

| | | p19 + | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ...... | TCV_sG6H | TCV_sg2R | V181A_sG6H | V181A_sg2R | F182A_sG6H | F182A_sg2R | TCV_sG6H + TCV-sg2R | V181A_sG6H + V181A_sg2R | F182A_sG6H + F182A_sg2R | | | |

← g

← sg1
← sg2

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12  13

EB

## B

| | GFP Channel | mCherry Channel | Merged | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TCV_sG6H + TCV-sg2R | | | | G: 21.00 ± 2.45%<br>R: 22.00 ± 4.00%<br>G+R: 0<br>(n = 5) |
| V181A_sG6H + V181A_sg2R | | | | G: 25.40 ± 5.32%<br>R: 21.60 ± 4.77%<br>G+R: 4.00 ± 1.22%<br>(n = 5) |

100 μm

**A**

**B**

**C**